

Message Text

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 STATE 141747

ORIGIN EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SS-15 DHA-02 ORM-02 SCA-01 SP-02

CU-02 CIAE-00 PM-04 INR-07 L-03 ACDA-07 NSAE-00

PA-01 PRS-01 USIA-06 TRSE-00 NSC-05 /071 R

DRAFTED BY EUR/RPM:JHMADDEN:PF

APPROVED BY EUR:GVEST

D:SOXMAN

C:RHOPPER

D/HA:CBRODY

SCA:JDEWITT

S/P:PKAPLAN

-----180136Z 124992 /72

P R 172355Z JUN 77

FM SECSTATE WASHDC

TO USMISSION NATO PRIORITY

INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS

AMEMBASSY BELGRADE

C O N F I D E N T I A L STATE 141747

BELGRADE FOR USDEL CSCE

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS:CSCE, UK

SUBJECT: UK NEW PROPOSALS PAPER

REFS: (A) STATE 84818; (B) USNATO 4804; (C) STATE 132824;

(D) USNATO 5139; (E) BELGRADE 4057

1. AS APPROPRIATE OCCASIONS ARISE IN POLADS DISCUSSIONS
YOU SHOULD CONTINUE TO TAKE POSITION THAT WORK SHOULD
BEGIN ON REDUCING LIST OF NEW PROPOSALS FOR FALL FOLLOW-
UP MEETING. WE DO NOT SHARE VIEW THAT IT IS TOO SOON
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 STATE 141747

TO START THIS PROCESS AND THAT WE SHOULD WAIT UNTIL LATE
SUMMER TO START. TRADITIONAL AUGUST VACATION PERIOD
WILL OBVIOUSLY AFFECT PACE OF WORK IN POLADS ON NEW
PROPOSALS, LEAVING ONLY LITTLE MORE THAN TWO MONTHS (JULY,
SEPTEMBER) FOR INTENSIVE WORK. OUR AIM SHOULD BE TO HAVE
A FEW NEW PROPOSALS IN EACH BASKET. FINAL DECISION ON
WHAT FEW THESE SHOULD BE CAN BE TAKEN AT A TIME CLOSER

TO BEGINNING OF FOLLOW-UP MEETING. WHAT WE NEED TO DO NOW IS TO CUT DOWN PROPOSALS AS CONTAINED IN CM(77)29 AND SUPPLEMENTED BY UK SUGGESTIONS TO A MORE MANAGEABLE LIST. IN VIEW OF RESERVATIONS BY SOME ALLIES, US WITHDREW PROPOSAL ON BOOKSTORES AND RECORD SHOPS. WE HOPE TO SEE OTHER PROPOSALS DROPPED SO THAT WE CAN DEVELOP TIGHT LIST

FOR FINAL DECISION ON LIMITED NUMBER OF PROPOSALS WHICH (1) STAND CHANCE OF SUCCESS AT BELGRADE, (2) ARE IN OUR INTRINSIC INTEREST, AND (3) ARE DESIGNED TO FURTHER IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS. FIRST STEP IN POLADS WORK SHOULD BE TO REVIEW DRAFT PROPOSALS IN CM(77)29 AND UK PROPOSALS WITH AIM TOWARD COMPILING LIST OF ALL PROPOSALS PRESENTLY ALIVE. WE COULD THEN PROCEED TO ORDERLY BOILING DOWN OF LIST.

2. IN MAKING ABOVE POINTS, YOU SHOULD NOTE THAT DRAFT PROPOSAL PAPERS WHICH US HAS SUBMITTED ARE DESIGNED FOR POSSIBLE TABLING AT BELGRADE. THESE PAPERS ARE BROADER THAN INDIVIDUAL UK PROPOSALS; FOR EXAMPLE, US PAPER ON RIGHTS OF APPLICANTS FOR FAMILY REUNIFICATION CONTAINS SEVERAL POINTS (UK PROPOSALS 5-7, PLUS OTHERS). DURING NEGOTIATING PROCESS WE WOULD ENVISAGE THAT SOME POINTS WOULD BE DROPPED FROM PAPER, SOME RETAINED, AND PERHAPS OTHERS ADDED. END RESULT MIGHT BE TEXT OF AGREED NEW PROPOSAL CONTAINING MORE THAN ONE POINT. WE PREFER THIS APPROACH TO UK METHOD OF PROPOSING TEXTUAL LANGUAGE ON EACH SPECIFIC POINT, BUT WOULD LIKE TO HEAR VIEWS OF ALLIES.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 STATE 141747

3. FOLLOWING ARE OUR COMMENTS ON UK PROPOSALS ACCORDING TO NUMBERING IN TEXT TRANSMITTED IN USNATO 4804. OUR COMMENTS ON PROPOSALS LISTED IN CM(77)29 ARE CONTAINED IN STATE 84818.

A. PROPOSALS 1-3. LIKE EC-9, WE ALSO HAVE RESERVATIONS ON POST-BELGRADE EXPERTS MEETING ON HUMAN RIGHTS IN VIEW OF (1) OUR POLICY ON EXPERTS MEETINGS AFTER FOLLOW-UP MEETING AND (2) SINCE WE BELIEVE PROPOSAL IS NON-STARTER SOVIETS CAN BE EXPECTED TO VIGOROUSLY OPPOSE IT. PROPOSALS : AND 3, ON RIGHTS OF INDIVIDUALS TO IMPART TO OTHERS INFORMATION ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND FINAL ACT IMPLEMENTATION AND NOT TO SUFFER PENALTIES FOR DOING SO ARE INTERESTING, BUT WOULD ALSO MOST LIKELY HAVE MINIMAL CHANCE OF ACCEPTANCE. WE WOULD, HOWEVER, LIKE TO STUDY THESE IDEAS FURTHER BEFORE TAKING FINAL POSITION.

B. PROPOSAL 4 - WE COULD SUPPORT PROPOSAL WHICH IS

SIMILAR TO INFORMAL US IDEA ON REDUCTION OR ELIMINATION OF REQUIREMENT FOR VISITORS TO CONVERT CERTAIN AMOUNTS OF CURRENCY UPON ENTRY INTO EASTERN COUNTRIES. PROPOSAL 4 SHOULD BE CHANGED TO INCLUDE ELIMINATION, AS WELL AS REDUCTION OF CURRENCY EXCHANGE REQUIREMENT. PHRASE "FOR ADVANCE HOTEL RESERVATIONS" SHOULD BE DROPPED. IN THIS CONNECTION YOU SHOULD DRAW ON BELGRADE 4057.

C. PROPOSALS 5-7. WE COULD SUPPORT THESE PROPOSALS WHICH EVIDENTLY ARE DERIVED FROM US PROPOSAL ON RIGHTS OF APPLICANTS FOR FAMILY REUNIFICATION.

D. PROPOSAL 8. WE INDICATED GENERAL SUPPORT FOR PROPOSAL LIKE THIS ON EXIT PERMITS, AS CONTAINED IN CM(77)29. HOWEVER, UK PROPOSAL 8 WOULD ESTABLISH THREE MONTHS AS DESIRED TIME LIMIT FOR PROCESSING APPLICATIONS FOR FAMILY REUNIFICATION, AS WELL AS FOR FAMILY VISITS. CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 STATE 141747

THERE ARE OCCASIONAL CASES WHERE PROCESSING OF EMIGRATION CASES FOR ENTRY INTO US TAKE LONGER THAN THREE MONTHS. WE QUESTION WHETHER THIS MIGHT NOT ALSO BE THE CASE IN SOME OTHER ALLIED COUNTRIES.

E. PROPOSAL 9. THIS PROPOSAL WOULD INTERPRET "MODERATE" LEVEL OF FEES MENTIONED IN FINAL ACT FOR DOCUMENTS CONNECTED WITH FAMILY REUNIFICATION TO MEAN THE EQUIVALENT OF ONE WEEK'S SALARY. THESE DOCUMENTS WOULD INCLUDE VISAS. PRESENT US IMMIGRANT VISA FEES TOTAL \$25 PER PERSON. WE WOULD HAVE TO COMPARE THIS AMOUNT TO EQUIVALENT SALARY LEVELS IN VARIOUS CSCE STATES TO ENSURE THAT WE COULD COMPLY WITH THIS STIPULATION. OTHER ALLIES MAY WISH TO DO THE SAME.

F. PROPOSAL 10. THIS PROPOSAL CALLS FOR UNIFIED SCALE OF VISA FEES AMONG ALL CSCE STATES FOR FAMILY VISITS, AND PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL TRAVEL. US WORLDWIDE POLICY ON SUCH FEES IS BASED ON PRINCIPLE OF RECIPROCITY, WHEREBY US CHARGES FEES TO FOREIGN CITIZENS IN LIKE AMOUNT TO THOSE CHARGED BY THEIR GOVERNMENTS TO US CITIZENS. MORE-OVER, US WORLDWIDE POLICY IS TO SEEK TO REDUCE SUCH FEES TO NO FEE BASIS TO FACILITATE WIDER TRAVEL. IN VIEW OF THIS, WE COULD NOT SUPPORT PROPOSAL 10. AS INDICATED IN STATE 84818, WE COULD SUPPORT SIMILAR PROPOSAL IN CM(77)29 WHICH CALLS FOR REDUCTION OR ELIMINATION OF NON-IMMIGRANT VISA FEES, BUT WHICH WOULD NOT SET A UNIFIED SCALE OF FEES AMONG ALL CSCE STATES.

G. PROPOSAL 11. THIS IS SIMILAR TO PROPOSAL IN CM(77)29. WE CONTINUE TO SUPPORT.

H. PROPOSAL 12. THIS IS EVIDENTLY ALTERNATIVE TO PROPOSAL 11. WE ARE PRESENTLY TRYING TO UNEARTH 1963 UN DOCUMENT REFERRED TO IN PROPOSAL 12 AND WILL COMMENT LATER.
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 05 STATE 141747

I. PROPOSAL 13. WE COULD SUPPORT THIS PROPOSAL ON WIDER ACCESS TO OFFICIAL FOREIGN DIPLOMATIC MISSIONS AND THEIR PERSONNEL.

J. PROPOSAL 14. THIS IS A NEW INITIATIVE CALLING FOR THE ELIMINATION OF ALL OBSTACLES TO RADIO BROADCASTING IN THE NEAR FUTURE. WE COULD SUPPORT THIS PROPOSAL. SOVIETS AND EASTERN EUROPEANS WOULD OBVIOUSLY OPPOSE IT, BUT SINCE LANGUAGE IN FINAL ACT REFERS IMPLICITLY TO REDUCTION IN JAMMING, ALLIES WOULD BE ON FIRM GROUND IN PUTTING PROPOSAL FORWARD.

K. PROPOSAL 15. WE COULD SUPPORT THIS PROPOSAL ON EXCHANGE OF LIVE BROADCASTS WHICH EVIDENTLY DERIVES FROM A US SUGGESTED PROPOSAL.

L. PROPOSAL 16. THIS PROPOSAL HAS BEEN WITHDRAWN.

M. PROPOSAL 17. THIS PROPOSAL ON EXPULSION OF JOURNALISTS DOES NOT SEEM TO EXPAND MUCH ON LANGUAGE OF FINAL ACT. WE BELIEVE IT SHOULD BE DROPPED IN FAVOR OF OTHERS WHICH WOULD SIGNIFICANTLY EXPAND ON OTHER BASKET III PROVISIONS.

N. PROPOSAL 18. WE HAVE ALREADY INDICATED SUPPORT FOR THIS PROPOSAL CALLING FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF FOREIGN PRESS ASSOCIATIONS IN OUR COMMENTS ON CM(77)29.

O. PROPOSAL 19. WE COULD SUPPORT THIS PROPOSAL CALLING FOR JOURNALISTS TO BE ABLE TO IMPORT PERSONAL REFERENCE MATERIAL CONNECTED WITH THEIR PROFESSIONAL DUTIES ON CONDITION THEY TAKE SUCH MATERIAL OUT AGAIN. HOWEVER, WE BELIEVE PROPOSAL WOULD HAVE LITTLE CHANCE OF ACCEPTANCE AT FOLLOW-UP MEETING, AND THAT IT SHOULD THEREFORE BE CANDIDATE FOR DELETION.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 06 STATE 141747

P. PROPOSAL 20. THIS IS US PROPOSAL WHICH WE WITHDREW

IN VIEW OF SOME ALLIED RESERVATIONS.

Q. PROPOSAL 21. WE SUPPORT THIS PROPOSAL WHICH DERIVES
FROM A US PROPOSAL ON ACCESS TO ARCHIVES.

VANCE

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01-Jan-1994 12:00:00 am
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: ALLIANCE, COLLECTIVE SECURITY, REPORTS, AMENDMENTS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Sent Date: 17-Jun-1977 12:00:00 am
Decaption Date: 01-Jan-1960 12:00:00 am
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 22 May 2009
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1977STATE141747
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: JHMADDEN:PF
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: GS
Errors: N/A
Expiration:
Film Number: D770217-1084
Format: TEL
From: STATE
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1977/newtext/t19770643/aaaablyi.tel
Line Count: 230
Litigation Code IDs:
Litigation Codes:
Litigation History:
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Message ID: 7476827a-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Office: ORIGIN EUR
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 5
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: 77 STATE 84818, 77 STATE 132824, 77 BELGRADE 4057
Retention: 0
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 31-Mar-2005 12:00:00 am
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review Media Identifier:
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
SAS ID: 2106903
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: UK NEW PROPOSALS PAPER
TAGS: PFOR, UK, CSCE
To: NATO BRUSSELS
Type: TE
vdkgvwkey: odb://SAS/SAS.dbo.SAS_Docs/7476827a-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Review Markings:
Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
22 May 2009
Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 22 May 2009